

# SOMETHING.

EDITED

BY NEMO NOBODY, ESQUIRE.

---

"Tis Something.....Nothing."

---

No. 4.]      Boston, Saturday, December 9, 1809.      [Vol. I.

---

## ON EDUCATION.—No. II.

No writer on this subject has (perhaps) been more frequently quoted than Solomon;—but, with deference to men of learning, we think his maxims have been sometimes introduced without a sufficient elucidation of his original meaning. The instructions of those acquainted with the learned languages, caution us to beware of adopting in the *limited literal* sense, subjects of *metaphorical allusion*; in the infancy of languages, we are told that, objects of our *external senses*, were selected for the purpose of explaining intellectual ideas, that a figurative style was then intentionally, and perhaps necessarily preferred. May we not then without presumption infer, that when Solomon says, "He that spareth the rod hateth his own son," and in other similar expressions, he adopts the term only as the *emblem* of that necessary authority and corrective influence which is ever the duty of the parent or instructor to exercise over erring youth, and not as the *instrument* itself. And we think we may venture to presume not only that Solomon himself never did, but that he never *intended* to recommend the use of the instrument we now call the rod, or any kind of corporal punishment, except in cases of the extremest necessity.

We are well aware that by this presumption we at once contend with contrary opinions of high authority; but as we have before observed, our object is truth; and in the pursuit of it, though we shall endeavour to preserve an humility correspondent to our talents, we shall not shrink from the performance of any duty we sincerely believe to be within the scope of them.

We declare in the first place our wishes, in the next our intentions; our wishes are to abolish as much as possible the application of corporal chastisement to children; our intentions are to plead for a restriction of

it.—But before we attempt the success of either, we shall endeavour to prove that the misinterpretation of words alone, and the adoption of *sensible* objects where only *intellectual ideas* were intended, have contributed in a great degree to the introduction of scripture as a sanction to the general personal chastisement of children.

“He that spareth the rod hateth his own child,” it is said, says Solomon.—Our object is not to dispute the maxims of Solomon on this head, but to enquire what they really were.

The first time the word rod is mentioned in the old testament (excepting Jacob’s policy) is in the 4th chapt. Exod. 2 verse, “And the Lord said unto him (Moses) what is that in thy hand? And he said, a rod.”

This certainly could be no other instrument than a shepherd’s wand or stick; for Moses was at that time keeping Jethro’s flock; but immediately afterwards we find it assigned to him as the emblem of his future authority. “And thou shalt take this *rod* in thine hand, *wherewith* thou shalt do *signs*”—again we are informed; “And Moses took, *the rod* of *God* in his hand.”—Let us now observe for what purpose—“That they, (the Israelites) might believe that the God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, had appeared unto him.” It seems then, from this earliest instance of the mention of a rod, and also from its mechanical formation, that it was delivered to Moses, not as the instrument of corporal infliction on the Israelites, but as the type or emblem of his delegated authority alone.

The second instance we shall introduce is from the 17th chapter of Numbers.

“And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying,

“Speak unto the children of Israel, and take of every one of them a rod according to the house of their fathers, of all their princes according to the house of their fathers, twelve rods: write thou every man’s name upon his rod.

“And thou shalt write Aaron’s name upon the rod of Levi; for *One* shall be for the *head* of the house of their fathers.”

Again, verse 6.

“And Moses spake unto the children of Israel, and every one of their princes gave him a rod a piece, for each prince one, according to their fathers’ houses, even twelve rods; and the rod of Aaron was among the rods.

“And Moses laid up the rods before the Lord in the tabernacle of witness.”

Now these rods could be no other than the emblems of authority which distinguished each one as the head of the house of his fathers, they were not the instruments of correction, but the type of power.



We will consider next the sense in which the father of Solomon adopts the word.—In the 23d, which is one of the Psalms of David, he observes—“Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me ; thy rod and thy staff they *comfort* me.”

The whole of this beautiful poetical effusion is allegorical. The rod is the emblem of authority and good government, the staff of support and nourishment—for in a preceding verse he observes—“He *maketh* me to lie down in green pastures, he leadeth me beside the still waters.

“He restoreth my soul : he leadeth me in the path of righteousness for his name’s sake.”

Here our ideas embrace a beautiful exemplification of the just exercise of authority ; for as David observes, the *Lord* being his shepherd, he shall not want ; for his rod, that is his paternal authority, *makes* him lie down in green pastures, or, in a literal sense, by confining him to virtuous and useful habits, restricts him from wandering in the pursuit of vicious indulgences ; and his staff, that is, his supporting influence, leads him for refreshment to the untroubled fountain of truth.

We have only one more explanation of the word rod to introduce before we examine Solomon’s meaning in *his* use of it ; and this is taken from the 125 Psalm. “For the rod of the wicked shall not rest upon the lot of the righteous.”

We would place this in a literal sense thus ;—The wicked shall have no permanent authority over the righteous ; lest the righteous, *put forth their hands*—(A SYMBOL of obedience or intreaty) to iniquity. It is common in the old testament to use the effect for the cause, iniquity consequently implies the workers of iniquity.

This passage then according to our interpretation means in the language of the present day, The wicked shall have no permanent authority over the righteous, lest the righteous should be forced to yield obedience to, or seek protection from the wicked.

Isaiah says, “the rod of mine anger and the staff in *their* hand, is *mine* indignation.”

Ezekiel, “I will cause you to pass under the rod”—symbol of submission on the one side, authority on the other.

Micah, “*Hear* the rod and who hath appointed it.”

Again. “*Feed* the people with thy rod.”

From the foregoing quotations it is evident that the word rod is at least frequently used as the symbol of authority, may we not therefore without presumption suppose, and without danger believe, that the same word is used generally by Solomon in a similar sense.

(To be continued.)

## THE CLERGY.

To the esteemed and highly respected clergy of these and other states, with many of whom we boast an acquaintance, we offer an apology for our occasional observations on the sacred scriptures; but we are attached to them by every tie that can bind a human being to his God, by every principle of taste that can admire sublimity in poetry, and by every essential doctrine that testifies a christian; and consequently, our only apology must be, that we were ourselves educated for that reverend profession; we have ever (inwardly) lamented our disobedience to our parents; but have ever, as we trust, advocated the cause of truth. This we will never desert. Custom allows laymen a greater *latitude* in writing, but we trust that the latitude allowed, will not contribute less decorously to the promotion of the general weal. Every advocate for just principles has had reason to bless the lay preacher of Philadelphia; —May none have reason to complain of *us*!

We must be witty, to inspire attention,  
Sin's surest remedy is, sly prevention.

## UNIVERSITY.

*We have been young ourselves,*

AND we solicit our young friends at Harward, with the permission of their government, to elicit their talents occasionally, and adorn our pages with youthful emanations of fancy or intelligence.

Carpe diem—

Dimidium facti, qui cœpit, habet.

Sapere aude.

"When I was a child I thought as a child." Now—

We find by rueful experience that there was something wanting in *our* education, we were not taught *to be*, but *to act* the man. But,

We were taught to make money

As bees make their honey, And,

Sec vos, non vobis mellificatis apes.

Our Harvard friends have without doubt heard of the

Musæ Etonenses,

Let them be rivalled by the

Musæ Harvardienses.

And let our pages be honored by their introduction.

Μελετῆ τὸ πᾶν.



*Theatre, Tuesday, Dec. 29.*

### RICHARD THE THIRD, AND THE LYING VALET.

THE tragedy of Richard the third as now represented, has been so changed from the original production, to answer the purposes of the actor, that it may now be considered merely as the vehicle of the talents of the person who performs the principal character in it.

However opposed the opinions of others may be, we still persist in our determination, that the change of Mr. Cooper's style of acting is the result of judgment and improvement.—It was formerly reported of Boston, that the actor who could make the greatest noise would please the audience the best; it is certain that while they suffer quietly and patiently so much disgraceful conduct in the galleries the actor *must* bellow to be heard. But is there no authority by which the respectable part of the audience can command their right of freedom from insult and indecency? The noises which perpetually disgrace our theatre, disturb the actors, and insult the public—discredit our police, our justice, and our freedom. The purchaser of a ticket for the boxes has a right guaranteed by the sellers of the ticket to a quiet and peaceable enjoyment of the entertainment promised; and no person purchases *more* than that right; no one purchases a privilege of creating noise, promoting disturbances, or offending modesty.

The character of our town is risked by the endurance of such irregularities, and it becomes every honest man, and is essentially the duty of every parent, husband, or brother, to whom the delicacy of female chastity is dear, to rise up at once and check the increasing evil—it may easily be remedied—it requires only in an *individual* a determination to do what's right to effect it, and let an *audience* be united in their resistance to such insults, and the fear of shame would enforce decency.

We know very well that our managers must be *compelled* to do their duty or they never will do it. But as we have already said much about the duty of managers, we shall in the course of this, give the hints we promised in our last number.

The liberties indulged in European theatres may be adduced in opposition to our remarks—but God forbid that we should plunge *at once* into the abyss of vice which marks the degeneracy, or prophecies the ruin of nations—let us at least be *great* before we become vicious; let us at least *rise* before we fall.

Regarding the character of Richard the third as performed by Mr. Cooper, we can have little more to say than that it *was performed by him*, and as we have already observed in an improved manner.—We have been on the stage ourselves, and we have felt the inconveniences, nay, distresses occasioned by, something deficient in the subordinate characters;

yet could we not with justice blame them ; a sudden exclamation may perhaps have condemned them, but reflexion always assured us that the original error was elsewhere.

Not excepting Mr. Cooper, we declare in our opinion the gentleman that deserved the most credit this evening was Mr. Johnston—of course we do not urge now a competition of *talents*, but a competition of *exertion*, and this is what the audience should encourage. We must foster *endeavours*, instead of lavishing our applause on *recommended* talents : let us have a theatre of our own, nursed by ourselves, and *corrected* by ourselves ; there are talents at the command of the managers, sufficient to make the Boston theatre equal in respectability to any on the continent ; we know it, and we will prove it to be so, before the present season is over, but the managers must change their plan of operations in their interior arrangements.

Why is any gentleman *suffered* to appear in a principal character for the first time on the stage, if his success is *less* than doubtful ? if his appearance and the candour of the public acknowledge some abilities, why is he not retained ? A manager's duty is to encourage, instruct, reform—not to make money, by deception. But to return—we think that Mr. Johnston's performance of the character of Henry the sixth, this evening entitled him fully to all the applause he received, and we hope will hereafter obtain for him all the encouragement his continued exertions may deserve.

Mrs. Powell was this evening completely at *home*, for, she was the amiable wife and the affectionate mother ; nor did the queen lessen her attractions—for she played an *honest* queen.

Mr. Mills was received on his *three* entrances with *extraordinary* applause—if this had *not* been the case, we would have supplied the deficiency—he played with more than usual spirit, and the battle between Mr. Cooper and himself was well contrived and executed.

We wish to praise and shall rejoice to do so when we have an opportunity of praising honourably.

*The Lying Valet.*

When obscenity is banished from the stage, we will praise acting that is not indebted to it for applause.

---

#### LADIES' GREAT COATS AND GENTLEMEN'S PETTY-COATS.

WHAT strange reversions in the order of things will not fashion introduce ?—Time was—when the word “petticoat” designated the sex to which that article exclusively appertained ; for instance—“he is led by the petticoat,” “he is under petticoat government,” &c. &c. &c. But if any man was to say now of another that he was under petticoat



government, it would only signify that he was under *no* government at all.—We presume that some of our patriotic youths have already perceived this difficulty in allusion, and therefore have adopted the *petty-coat* themselves, to prove that they are only under their *own* government.

As however in return the ladies have taken the *great* coats from the men, and as in this instance we think them perfectly justifiable, we do not know, a less *indelicate* term that can be applied to what they have substituted for the privileges they have bartered than *justifiable*s.

We do therefore (by our paperal authority as heretofore) order all shopkeepers henceforth not to put the ladies to the blush by calling these articles, invisibles—but to offer them for sale under the *head* of *justifiable*s and charge accordingly, the usual advance for fashionable titles.

All shopkeepers who shall presume to sell, after this our imperial (paper) order, any such *inexpressible* articles under any other name than the above, shall be considered as dealing in contra-band goods, and liable to (pun-is meant) accordingly.

---

#### PROMISED HINTS.

WE consider that the duties of managers do not consist alone in advertising plays and receiving the profits of the receipts.—A moral choice in the selection of them, a minute attention to the rehearsal, and a pledge for the honourable performance of them are indispensable obligations incurred by their undertaking.

We think it is dishonest to invite the public to a whole play and give them only half of it, or a larger part so mutilated that they who wish to understand it, are obliged to come a second time, for the additions that may be then made.

Every individual has as much his private right, though composing part of the audience, as if he had made a private bargain for himself alone. And this right should in honesty be *secured* to him.

All public establishments are really, or supposed to be, under some written or acknowledged regulations; there is at least an implied contract which ought to be fulfilled. We promised the managers a few hints and therefore we keep our word.

---

*Theatre, Monday, Dec. 4th, 1809.*

#### MACBETH, AND MY GRANDMOTHER.

“HE is to appear this evening for the only time in the character of *Macbeth*, and supported by *all the talent* of the company, we may expect a rich entertainment.”

*Communication—Gazette, Dec. 4th.*

WE select this passage, for our motto, for we most willingly admit that Mr. Cooper *was* supported by all the *talent* of theatre—but the friendly communicator did not inform us how much he was to be *undermined* by the *want* of it in the inferior characters, as they are called, though in our opinion, they are as essential to the perfect performance of a regular drama, as the principal actor himself. For,

It is in the power of *any* one actor if incompetent, or inattentive to, his part to destroy the effect of the best scene ever written by Shakespeare.

We wish not to wound the feelings of a father, but we must and *will* perform our duty to the public. At *present* enough.

We presume that the character allotted to Mr. Barnes, was undertaken by him, more from a willingness to oblige, than from his own ambition to figure in tragedy.

The triumvirate were completely bewitched in the opening scene, they could neither get up nor down; we should have thought that managers might have managed better; we have never known them before without a hole to creep through, but on this occasion they were most laughably caught in their own traps.—The entrance of Birnam wood was well—but we did not see its exit.

Does no one attend to the duties of the supernumeraries? If they are suffered to play their tricks *ad libitum*—we shall only ask how much longer the public are to be insulted?

We hope we have already said enough respecting the disturbances in the galleries, if the managers do not prevent such disgraceful conduct, we say that the public *will*.

We now, having as we think, performed the unpleasant part of our duty on this evening, will indulge in our more grateful task.

If we dared before, in *contradiction* to general opinion, to assert the improved taste in acting of Mr. Cooper, what must be our pleasure in praising his performance this evening when, acting upon the same principle, we find his performance of the character of Macbeth approved by all?

We know what it is, not to receive manual applause, when we think we deserve it, and have been accustomed to hear it, and we fear that Mr. Cooper on some occasions, condescended to extort it from a part of the audience, while the whole of it, were paying him the more honourable tribute of silence.

Applause injudiciously bestowed very often destroys the effect it intends to continue. Applause is necessary to the encouragement of a *young* actor, and we would recommend it on *all* occasions, where ladies or gentlemen in subordinate characters make successful efforts; but to applaud with hands or sticks in the intervals of a highly wrought scene,



supported by performers of acknowledged merit, we think tends only to weaken the interest of the scene, and check, by exciting others, the necessary feelings for the completion of it.

The merits of an actor can be sufficiently rewarded by the public, in this regard, by applause bestowed on him at his exit, or during such pauses as are naturally occasioned by the complete effusion of passion, the declarations of moral sentiment, or the termination of declamatory or historical speeches.

We know not that Macbeth followed Richard the third, upon any other principle than that of convenience; but if the managers, or rather Mr. Cooper, for we presume from the superior order which obtains during his stay, that he has some controul, *did* intend to draw a contrast between the effects of predetermined vice, and the incidental introduction of it to a virtuous mind, they happily succeeded.

The characters of Richard the third and Macbeth, are as distinctly, as *differently* decided on their introduction. The former is declared to have been vicious from his birth; his mother says of, and to, him,

A grievous burthen was thy birth to me,  
Tetchy and wayward was thy infancy,  
Thy school days, frightful, desperate, wild and furious;  
Thy prime of manhood, daring, bold and venturous;  
Thy age confirm'd, proud, subtle, sly, and bloody;  
More mild, but yet more harmful, kind in *hatred*.

But the character in which Macbeth is introduced to us is widely different; indeed it is the former character reversed.—We have not room for quotation, to exemplify it.

We shall only say, we think generally that both characters were performed by Mr. Cooper, in a more chaste and impressive style than we have ever before witnessed.

It would add nothing to Mr. Cooper's fame, were we to quote *all* the passages in which he excelled. The dagger scene, the soliloquies, the management in the supper scene, were among the most impressive features of his acting; but we cannot omit mentioning our admiration of his manner of resisting the first attack of Mackduff, and, in general, the very strongly marked changes in the different characters of Macbeth, for he has many, and many were exhibited to us distinctly performed this evening.

Macbeth in the last scene (though Birnam wood has come to Dunsinane) still relies for his safety on the prediction, that "none of woman born shall harm Macbeth"—he trusts therefore to the *prediction* rather than his *sword*, and this *idea* was for the first time displayed in *acting* (to us) by Mr. Cooper.

We are sorry that Mr. Cooper still says, "if trembling I *inhibit*." The word was originally "*inhabit*"—stay at home—*inhibit* was one of Mr. Pope's *polished* improvements; "*then*," was changed into "*thee*" by Mr. Stevens, and Mr. Malone *sanctified* the alteration. But we like Shakespeare better than all the commentators, as we like the old English language better than all the rest.

Why should we *not* read?

Dare me to the *desart* with thy sword

If, trembling I *inhabit*, then, &c.

That is, if, trembling then I stay at home, &c. For so it appears in the first folio, which is "worth all the rest."

There is another equally contested passage, on which we would suggest to Mr. Cooper *our* ideas, notwithstanding that so many pages have already been written on it.

We must be brief—and therefore will only *point* it according to our suggestion.

"My May of life

"Is fallen into the *sear*: the yellow leaf,  
(the honours of natural decay)

"And that which *should* accompany old age, &c.

"I must not look to have."

Mrs. Powell was as usual when she plays a *bad* character, *not* at home in it. The audience were grateful to her for the violence every mother must do to her own feelings, in pronouncing the lines beginning thus:

"I have given suck," &c.

But they can never be omitted with justice to the author.

In her last scene she gave general satisfaction.

We will take the liberty of suggesting to her, in prose, our interpretation of the passage.

"My royal lord,

"You do not give the cheer," &c.

You *sell* your feast, if you do not often tell your guests that they are *welcome*, while you are giving it; if the intention is that they should only *eat* they might do *that* better at their homes, but *from* thence, when on a visit, the sauce to meat is *ceremony*,—that is, a proper attention to your guests.

"The *appurtenance* to *welcome* is fashion and ceremony." HAMLET.

We would hint to the gentleman who may *hereafter* perform the bleeding soldier that the western isles of Scotland are not named Kernes and Gallow-glasses; but that Kernes and Gallow-glasses were men—the one *light* armed, the other *heavy* armed foot soldiers.

Mr. Claude deserved and obtained great credit for his performance of Banquo, and when he appeared as his ghost, his minute attention and correct action were very impressive.



We wish that we could speak as favourably of Mr. Johnston in the character of Duncan, as we have spoken of him in Henry 6th—the art of an actor is often discovered by his making small characters great.

“Though last—not least.”

Mr. Mills encountered many difficulties this evening which may be understood by the foregoing remarks; he surmounted them in the conclusion of the best scene of Macduff, by the energy of his *own* talents.

We know the arduous duty this gentleman has generally to execute, and therefore cannot perhaps with justice, complain of an occasional deficiency, or substitution of words.

Pressed as we are for room for observations on the occurrences of this week, we cannot with propriety suffer the above remarks to go to press, without expressing our admiration of the superior performance of the vocal harmonists this evening. We must conclude by saying that in spite of the few \*\*\*\*\* which occurred, we think on the whole, that the tragedy of Macbeth never gave more pleasure to the Boston audience.

*My Grandmother.*

Though we shall never pretend to analyse, or make many observations on farces while offered to us in mutilated states, we shall always recommend whatever will afford to the public an *innocent* amusement: as such and as something more, we can venture to recommend this.

First impressions weigh powerfully on the mind, but we *endeavour* to divest ourselves of them. Mr. Dickenson's Gossip, we think *excellent*.—Mrs. Mills' songs were charming—give us nature, and let all Italian fopperies return to Rome. Mr. Mills made *not* a “faux pas,” but a “*lapisus linguæ*,” in the farce, which caused some merriment; it was occasioned by the accidental substitution of the word “cigar” for guitar.

We should not have noticed it, had it not given us a pleasant opportunity of praising at the same time the appropriate behaviour of Mr. Mills.—We like to see the *gentleman* exhibited by other means than dress; a man to be a gentleman must do his *duty*; and Mr. Mills on this occasion did perform *his* duty nobly, by acknowledging at once his accidental error, and silently entreating the public indulgence—he *had* their indulgence, and *applause*.

And may the esteem which will be attached to Mr. Mills' conduct on this occasion be the attendant of every actor who has sense enough to deserve it.

---

#### HINTS.

We thank our friends for their hints about spaces—but the world differ in opinion—some think they have too little, and others think we give them *too much*; we declare that we are not ourselves fond of vacuities

of any kind, we will therefore fill up the vacuities of our pages in future, in hopes that the public will fill the vacuity of our purse; for let the public be assured that it costs something to write sixteen pages per week; however till the world reforms, and so long as we discover or observe follies, we shall always have enough to say. We are very ready to take hints, when they are given to us, and some will perceive that we are equally ready to borrow hints from them.

Tuesday, Dec. 5th, 1809.

MR. OGILVIE.

ORATION ON DUELLING.

EVERY person who attempts to do a public good, deserves credit, at least for the *attempt*. But an attempt to eradicate the practice of duelling by delivering orations on the subject, is in our opinion futile in the extreme. What despotic kings and legislatures almost equally despotic; what wise men of all civilized nations, under whatsoever government they existed, have concurred in their endeavours to abolish, and with all the energies at their command, have failed in executing; can we expect from an oration, even the most polished, the most argumentative, and the most impressive, delivered to a few, comparatively few, individuals? Mr. Ogilvie may be assured that, if we know any thing of the world, his orations on this subject will have no good effect. His words, his actions, his figures, and his fashion may please an audience, but he will never accomplish any moral good by it; of this we should presume his own experience and feelings would convince him. We may approve his sentiments and applaud them, but why does any person applaud a sentiment but because it is congenial to his own feelings? and if congenial to them, his own feelings would dictate all that could be told to him. We do not want to be informed of what we *ought* to do, we have Moses and the prophets, we have all learnt it from our cradles,—what we want is to be persuaded to *do* what we know to be right.

With the most sincere attachment, we admire Mr. Ogilvie's talents, but we are not thereby bound on all occasions to adore the *application* of them; and with the freedom of opinion which we shall always, even with respect to our dearest friends, assume, we condemn the oration delivered this evening, "in toto." But, while we are giving our opinions, let it be considered that our base is professedly public good, and that we shall always judge of public offerings of every nature according to our estimation of their *effects*. Yet will we always be candid—and say *why* we disapprove of them.

We have nothing to do with what is *promised*; nothing to depend upon for *future* refutations; we judge of the oration as it was deliver-



ed this evening. We may all be in our graves before the answers in favour of duelling may be delivered, and in the mean time they who heard Mr. Ogilvie this evening may according to the summary of his oration, fight on warrantable ground. We have before privately objected to this oration, we now object to it publicly. We say that *arguments*, and strong ones, were advanced in *favor* of duelling, and observations or interjections only were opposed to them. We have been often publicly promised by Mr. Ogilvie a refutation of these arguments, and we expect them on Tuesday next.—But, we shall expect—argument, not declamation only.

Mr. Ogilvie has a fair opportunity of meeting us on this occasion, on equal terms; he is perfectly at liberty from *our* feeling, to make what use he pleases of our remarks—but we hope that Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Fennell may always shake hands, although the orator and the editor may disagree.

We send *our* "Something" into the world, but without any expectation that every body will be pleased with it; *we* have opponents, and should be sorry if we had none.

---

Theatre, Wednesday, Dec. 6th, 1809.

#### OTHELLO, AND HIGH LIFE BELOW STAIRS.

We purposely omitted the mention of Mr. Claude in our remarks on the tragedy of Richard the third, because, we expected that in the course of a few evenings he would afford us an opportunity of expatiating more generally on his merits—that expectation is now realized; we can now speak of him as a principal ornament even in the tragedy of Othello. We think, (excepting Mr. Cooper's last scene) that his acting in the part of Cassio was elegant, appropriate, and impressive, beyond that of any male character engaged in the performance. The interesting manner in which he conducted himself after the rebuke from Othello, and the delicately delivered observations on drunkenness, did him great honour.

Mr. Mills was not perfect in his part, yet notwithstanding accidental omissions which we regretted, there were some *retained* lines which we think deserved omission rather than utterance.

We are not fastidious, but we believe that a polished distinction may be made between *wanton* indelicacies, and the *forced* effusions of passion.

We need not blush at words, that merely designate characters whom all know to exist—that would be the foppery of modesty; but we shrink from any thing that tends to increase the number of them.

Mrs. Darley is a pretty woman, has a most sweet voice, and a polished action, she has, besides, as we think, the best conception of Shakspeare of any lady on our stage; but we must not suffer all these quali-

of any kind, we will therefore fill up the vacuities of our pages in future, in hopes that the public will fill the vacuity of our purse; for let the public be assured that it costs something to write sixteen pages per week; however till the world reforms, and so long as we discover or observe follies, we shall always have enough to say. We are very ready to take hints, when they are given to us, and some will perceive that we are equally ready to borrow hints from them.

—+—  
Tuesday, Dec. 5th, 1809.

MR. OGILVIE.

ORATION ON DUELLING.

EVERY person who attempts to do a public good, deserves credit, at least for the *attempt*. But an attempt to eradicate the practice of duelling by delivering orations on the subject, is in our opinion futile in the extreme. What despotic kings and legislatures almost equally despotic; what wise men of all civilized nations, under whatsoever government they existed, have concurred in their endeavours to abolish, and with all the energies at their command, have failed in executing; can we expect from an oration, even the most polished, the most argumentative, and the most impressive, delivered to a few, comparatively few, individuals? Mr. Ogilvie may be assured that, if we know any thing of the world, his orations on this subject will have no good effect. His words, his actions, his figures, and his fashion may please an audience, but he will never accomplish any moral good by it; of this we should presume his own experience and feelings would convince him. We may approve his sentiments and applaud them, but why does any person applaud a sentiment but because it is congenial to his own feelings? and if congenial to them, his own feelings would dictate all that could be told to him. We do not want to be informed of what we *ought* to do, we have Moses and the prophets, we have all learnt it from our cradles,—what we want is to be persuaded to *do* what we know to be right.

With the most sincere attachment, we admire Mr. Ogilvie's talents, but we are not thereby bound on all occasions to adore the *application* of them; and with the freedom of opinion which we shall always, even with respect to our dearest friends, assume, we condemn the oration delivered this evening, "in toto." But, while we are giving our opinions, let it be considered that our base is professedly public good, and that we shall always judge of public offerings of every nature according to our estimation of their *effects*. Yet will we always be candid—and say *why* we disapprove of them.

We have nothing to do with what is *promised*; nothing to depend upon for *future* refutations; we judge of the oration as it was deliver-



ed this evening. We may all be in our graves before the answers in favour of duelling may be delivered, and in the mean time they who heard Mr. Ogilvie this evening may according to the summary of his oration, fight on warrantable ground. We have before privately objected to this oration, we now object to it publicly. We say that *arguments*, and strong ones, were advanced in *favor* of duelling, and observations or interjections only were opposed to them. We have been often publicly promised by Mr. Ogilvie a refutation of these arguments, and we expect them on Tuesday next.—But, we shall expect—argument, not declamation only.

Mr. Ogilvie has a fair opportunity of meeting us on this occasion, on equal terms; he is perfectly at liberty from *our* feeling, to make what use he pleases of our remarks—but we hope that Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Fennell may always shake hands, although the orator and the editor may disagree.

We send *our* “Something” into the world, but without any expectation that every body will be pleased with it; *we* have opponents, and should be sorry if we had none.

---

Theatre, Wednesday, Dec. 6th, 1809.

#### OTHELLO, AND HIGH LIFE BELOW STAIRS.

We purposely omitted the mention of Mr. Claude in our remarks on the tragedy of Richard the third, because, we expected that in the course of a few evenings he would afford us an opportunity of expatiating more generally on his merits—that expectation is now realized; we can now speak of him as a principal ornament even in the tragedy of Othello. We think, (excepting Mr. Cooper’s last scene) that his acting in the part of Cassio was elegant, appropriate, and impressive, beyond that of any male character engaged in the performance. The interesting manner in which he conducted himself after the rebuke from Othello, and the delicately delivered observations on drunkenness, did him great honour.

Mr. Mills was not perfect in his part, yet notwithstanding accidental omissions which we regretted, there were some *retained* lines which we think deserved omission rather than utterance.

We are not fastidious, but we believe that a polished distinction may be made between *wanton* indelicacies, and the *forced* effusions of passion.

We need not blush at words, that merely designate characters whom all know to exist—that would be the foppery of modesty; but we shrink from any thing that tends to increase the number of them.

Mrs. Darley is a pretty woman, has a most sweet voice, and a polished action, she has, besides, as we think, the best conception of Shakspeare of any lady on our stage; but we must not suffer all these quali-

ties combined, to shake or bias our judgment, with regard to any *particular* character she represents. All the above qualifications may be united in one lady, yet may the character she assumes be inadequately represented.—These observations however cannot be applied to Mrs. Darley's performance *this* evening, they assisted her in representing the character Brabantio had described, and when her last words were uttered—*Desdemona* died.

---

*From the Boston Patriot.*

TO NEMO NOBODY, Esq.

SIR,

It may be presumption to differ with you in opinion; but as you court notice, and consequently aim at *existence*, it would be hard indeed, were I to refuse you an answer. Your reply to a small paragraph of mine in the Boston Patriot, is hardly worthy of notice. Had you understood me, you would have seen nothing to have sneered at. When I said Mr. Mills was no Ghost, I spoke of the performance *comparatively*—and if you never saw Mr. Harper in that character, it is impossible for you to decide whether or not I was *correct in opinion*—for after all, it is but a matter of opinion, we have each of us asserted—"no more"—However, to give you a clear idea of my opinion of Mr. Mills' Ghost, I need merely observe, that it was in comparison with Mr. Harper's, what Mr. Fennell's Hamlet is to Mr. Cooper's.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

TO \*\*\*\*\*

SIR,

Our mutual presumption we admit to be equal. We do not "court notice, and consequently aim at *existence*;" but, we aim at existence, and consequently court notice; but *as* we aim at existence, it would indeed have been *hard*, had you refused us your vital spark, for without it we could no longer have existed: we cannot but regret that so much pain has been received from a reply, "hardly worthy of notice." We profess a *common* share of understanding, but do not profess to understand what cannot be understood.

We are not so skilled in grammar as to ascertain how a positive assertion of a negative can convey a comparative idea.—Our having seen or not seen Mr. Harper in the character of the Ghost, would in neither case prove the impossibility of our deciding on the correctness of *your* judgment; for *we* judge not by comparison of persons: we cannot however agree with you that all "is but matter of opinion." We thank you for the *clear* idea you intended to give us, but although we acknowledge as readily as any one, that Mr. Cooper's Hamlet is superior to



Mr. Fennell's, we still contend that even this acknowledgment does not prove that Mr. *Mills* did not perform the Ghost well.

We are, with sentiments of the highest consideration, &c. &c.

NEMO NOBODY.

We know the author of the above letter—Our *Badinage* is with the writer, not the man.

An Italian writer says that there are thirty one points necessary to form a perfect beauty, we shall at present only quote one of them—a *natural* complexion.

Some gentlemen, we know not whom, presented us lately with a season ticket of admission to the theatre; as their delicacy prevented a personal acknowledgment, we beg leave publickly to thank them, not so much for the gift, as for the manner of presenting it.

#### ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The author of the piece to which these expressions are attached “if you are not afraid” &c. “if you do none of these, dread my anger” will find that his effusions are *not* inserted.

We have been favoured, with several *valuable* communications this week, some perhaps not intended for publication. We thank all who *intend* us good, but we shall look with a very jealous eye on all *pretended* aid.

We wish not to offend, or be ungrateful—but “Something” must be *something*. We ask not assistance, but we wish to *encourage* sterling merit. We do not consider ourselves bound to the publick by common but un-common ties; we sent no subscription papers round the town to obtain names, we have courted no assistance, we have not bowed to fashion, bent the knee to pride, or doffed our cap to riches. That, therefore, we may not hereafter be troubled with such *base* applications as have been made to us this week, we again declare, that sink or swim we will deliver only our own opinions, and those opinions shall be delivered as they are excited by contingent occurrences.

“Something” shall not only have none of those deceptive “communications” which, (but that they may be considered as advertisements, though not “paid for”) would disgrace our journals; but while it lives, it *shall* be the organ of honesty if not of correct judgment.

The above observations are the foundation of our excuse to some who *thought* they favoured us with their *good* things.

We thank W. for his good inclinations—but he flatters.

By Gemini "Cancer" is but a crab—he must crawl backwards.

Hortensia is mistaken.

LEO.

Some censure us, as they think, by telling us that "Something" is not sweet enough for the ladies ; we love and respect them too sincerely to talk nonsense to them.

---

Theatre, Friday Dec. 8th. 1809.

MR. COOPER was this evening advertised to perform six nights more. We congratulate the public on his continued engagement.

---

#### FOR THE LADIES. A CONTRADICTION.

Not like love's the gaudy rose,  
Nor the sweetest flow'r that blows ;  
Such to the *sense* their charms impart,  
But own no influence o'er the *heart*,  
Like true love.

Love's *soil's* the pure *untainted* mind ;  
Its stalk, esteem and friendship twin'd ;  
Reason its root, its blossom bliss ;  
And where it thrives—is paradise.  
Such is love.

But if *aught* compares with love,  
'Tis the *monarch* of the grove ;  
While his arms their shade dispense  
Shelt'ring sleeping innocence  
Just like love.

Transient rose ! *thy* proud display  
Yields each ruder gust a prey ;  
While the oak in triumph reigns,  
And to storms to bend disdains,  
Like true love.